UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/518,873	12/20/2004	Jochen Fink	PP/1-22699/A/CGM 515/PCT	3532

324 7590 06/26/2007

CIBA SPECIALTY CHEMICALS CORPORATION
PATENT DEPARTMENT
540 WHITE PLAINS RD
P O BOX 2005
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591-9005

EXAMINER	
MULLIS, JEFFREY C	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1711	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/518,873	FINK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 April 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 7-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5 and 7-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

All precious rejections are hereby withdrawn due to applicants amendment..

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "average molecular weight" where unqualified as to the type of sttistcal distribution of molecular weight (for instance number or weight average) is uclear since the various expressions of molecular weight vary.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kazmaier et al. (US 5,919,861).

Patentees disclose a process in which styrene is polymerized in the presence of TEMPO (encompassed by applicants generic structure of instant claim 2) to yield a TEMPO terminated polystyrene which is then reacted at 200 degrees centigrade with an unsaturated polyester with physical blending having weight average molecular weight of 107,000 (Example V in column 29). Since the material is of high molecular weight and is apparently not thermoset (as evidenced by the fact that molecular weight

measurements were possible), the product would reasonably appear to be thermoplastic or elastomeric. Since applicants and patentees both may contact a polymer with nitroxyl terminated oligomer while heating patentees product would reasonably appear to be a graft as required by the claims. Note examples I-IV for similar reactions (although temperature is not specified) where the production of a "graft" is explicitly disclosed. Furthermore as known in the art and disclosed by Kazmaier, nitroxyl terminated polymers and oligomers are capable of reinitiating polymerization of unsaturated compounds and therefore reaction of patentees nitroxyl terminated polystyrene with the unsaturation in the polyester (such as would result in a graft) would be assumed by those skilled in the art.

When the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function, and the Examiner cannot determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention, basis exists for shifting the burden of proof to applicant. Note In re Fitzgerald et al. 619 F. 2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596, (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112-2112.02.

Claims 1-5 and 7-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chin et al. (US 6,444,754).

Patentees in Example 3 disclose a process in which a polystyrene produced by polymerization of styrene in the presence of a nitroxyl compound having a glycidyl group is contacted at 235-275 degrees centigrade with thermoplastics having epoxy reactive groups such as polyamide or PPE. Note Example 3 in this re and also that styrenic bloc copolymer is present. Since the glycidyl group containing polystyrene would be expected by those skilled in the art to be reactive with at least the sort of end units expected to be present in PPE and polyamide as well as the maleic anhydride moieties and residual unsaturation of the SEBS (admittedly which would be present in very small amounts), those skilled in the art would assume a graft would be formed.

When the reference discloses all the limitations of a claim except a property or function, and the Examiner cannot determine whether or not the reference inherently possesses properties which anticipate or render obvious the claimed invention, basis exists for shifting the burden of proof to applicant. Note In re Fitzgerald et al. 619 F. 2d 67, 70, 205 USPQ 594, 596, (CCPA 1980). See MPEP § 2112-2112.02.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey C. Mullis M-F, 9-5pm at telephone number 571 272 1075.

Jeffrey C. Mullis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1711

JCM

6-20-07

Jeffrey Mullis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1711

Jeffrey Mullis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1711